

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1-14 and 76 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 76 have been amended to recite that any approvals are removed if the locked document has been unlocked. Antecedent support in the specification can be found at page 11, lines 9-12.

Claims 1 and 76 have also been amended to delete previously added language that is deemed unnecessary and/or superfluous in view of the newly recited language added to the claims as discussed above.

No new matter is believed to be added. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

### Claim Rejections

#### (1) Objections - 35 USC 132(a)

Withdrawal of the pending Section 132 objection is requested. Applicants maintain that the language objected to as constituting new matter did not in fact constitute new matter. Adequate support for the language was present in the specification at the page and line numbers indicated in Applicant's response dated October 20, 2008. However in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have deleted the objected to language in the present application.

#### (2) Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-14 and 76 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) in view of Grainger (US 2002/0111824) and Parks (US 6,038,573).

Claims 1-14 and 76 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) in view of Grainger (US 2002/0111824), Parks (US 6,038,573), and Jeffrey (US 6,957,384).

Appl. No. 09/808,001  
Atty. Docket No. 8380LS/PRGA 0103 PUSP  
Amdt. Dated 06/26/2009  
Reply to Office Action of 02/3/2009  
Customer No. 27752

In response thereto, Claims 1 and 76 have been amended as indicated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. The locked document, as per the claims, is circulated to the approval group members in a locked format. This prevents the review members from modifying the technical standards. However if, for any reason, anyone (including an approval member or another person) unlocks the document, thereby introducing a potential loss of integrity of the data, any approvals received up to that point are removed. The process must then begin again in order to obtain an approved technical standard.

#### Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejections and objections. Favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-14 and 76 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By / Leonard W. Lewis /  
Leonard W. Lewis  
Registration No. 30,769  
(513) 983-7430

June 26, 2009  
Customer No. 27752